

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed May 2, 2006. Reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1 – 22 are pending in the application with Claims 7 – 11 having been previously withdrawn from further prosecution. Of the remaining elected claims, Claims 1 and 12 are in independent form. By the present amendment, Claims 1 and 12 have been amended. No new subject matter is introduced into the disclosure by way of the present amendment.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 4 and 5 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,866,526 issued to Ams et al.

In response, Claim 1 has been amended to recite: "...a first adjusting step of comparing video signals, which are produced from illumination light rays that are reflected from an object and whose wavelengths fall within first, second, and third ranges, with one another, and regulating a duty cycle of a lamp current that flows into a light source lamp; a second light adjusting step of adjusting a diaphragm that controls an amount of light which is emitted from the light source lamp and which is irradiated to the object; and a storing step of storing the duty cycle of the lamp current regulated at the first adjusting step and a light limiting level adjusted at the second adjusting step." Support for the amendment to Claim 1 can be found in FIG. 2B, and page 14, lines 5 – 18 and page 16, lines 7 – 13.

Ams discloses a first signal for a lamp control, which increases the light intensity of a rare-gas arc lamp in synchronism with the generation of individual color separations; and a second signal for a diaphragm control, which is generated only when the lamp control is no longer able to regulate the video signals to the desired value. (See: col. 4, lines 1 – 21).

Contrastingly, Applicant's first adjusting step regulates a duty cycle, e.g., duration, of a lamp current that flows into a light source lamp. The light intensity of the lamp, however, is maintained at a constant level by the first adjusting step. Applicant's disclosed second light adjusting step controls the light intensity irradiating an illuminated object by adjusting a diaphragm.

It is well-settled by the Courts that "[A]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim." *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Company, et al.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481 (Fed. Cir., 1984).

Therefore, as demonstrated above, because Ams does not disclose each and every element recited in the present claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection has been obviated. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 1, 4 and 5 over 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

II. Rejection of Claims 2, 3, 6 and 12 – 22 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2, 3, 6 and 12 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Ams et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,187,572 issued to Nakamura et al.

In response, Claim 12 has been amended to recite: "...a controller that is included in the light source device, that compares luminance levels, which are specified in the first, second, and third color signals, with one another, and that adjusts an amount of light emitted from the light source lamp, to which the lamp lighting circuit supplies a current, by varying a duty cycle of the current supplied so that the ratio of the luminance level specified in the first color signal to the one specified in the second color signal to the one specified in the third color signal falls within a predetermined range..."

Thus, including a similar limitation as in Claim 1 directed towards adjusting the light emitted from the light source by varying the duty cycle of the supplied current. As presented above, Ams fails to disclose varying the duty cycle of a lamp current as a method for adjusting the white balance, but rather teaches adjusting light output intensity only.

Nakamura discloses performing white balance correction of the picture signal itself, by adjusting the level of each component color of the picture signal based on stored white balance data. However, Nakamura does not disclose or suggest performing white balance correction by adjusting the duty cycle of the lamp current that flows into the light source lamp as recited in Applicant's amended Claim 12.

Therefore, Nakamura fails to overcome the above-identified deficiencies present in Ams. Consequently, Ams and Nakamura, taken alone or in any proper combination, fail to disclose or suggest Applicant's invention as recited in amended Claim 12.


Claims 2, 3, 6 and 13 – 22 depend from independent Claims 1 and 12 and thus include all the limitations recited by those independent claims. Therefore Claims 2, 3, 6 and 12 – 22 are patentably distinct and allowable over the cited prior art references for at least the reasons provided above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 2, 3, 6 and 12 – 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ams et al. in view of Nakamura et al.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1 – 6 and 12 – 22 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas Spinelli
Registration No. 39,533

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza - Ste. 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

TS:DAT:jam